

# Library Co-Op/State Aid Funding

## September 24, 2007 Meeting

### Draft Notes

*The following information was gathered by facilitators. The intent of this information is to help the group continue their discussion with a foundation of shared work.*

***No decisions were made in this meeting.***

#### **Meeting Attendees:**

Nancy Robertson (State Librarian)  
Nick Bozen (HAL Office of Regulatory Affairs and Legislative Liaison)  
Gretchen Couraud (Executive Director, Michigan Library Association)  
Suzanne Dees (Superiorland Library Cooperative, Upper Peninsula Region of Library Cooperation)  
Mark Hoffman (HAL Deputy Director)  
Ann Holt (Capital Library Cooperative)/Jim Seidl (Woodlands Library Cooperative)  
Betsy Hull (Community District Library, Class 4, Mideastern Michigan Library Cooperative)  
Kay LaPierre (Richland Community Library, Class 2, Southwest Michigan Library Cooperative)  
Joan LundBorg (Hart Area Public Library, Class 3, Mid-Michigan Library League)  
Sheryl Mase (Library of Michigan Director of Statewide Services)  
Valerie Meyerson (Charlevoix Public Library, Class 3, Northland Library Cooperative)  
Heidi Nagel (Ionia Community Library, Class 4, Lakeland Library Cooperative)  
Larry Neal (Clinton-Macomb Public Library, Class 6, Suburban Library Cooperative)  
Stephanie Olson (Iosco-Arenac District Library, Class 5, White Pine Library Cooperative)  
Nancy Skowronski (Detroit Public Library, Class 6/Detroit Library Cooperative)  
Jean Tabor (Canton Public Library, Class 6, The Library Network)  
Lance Werner (Library of Michigan Library Law Specialist)  
Trixie Wint (Homer Public Library, Class 1, Woodlands Library Cooperative)

Joyce Ruttan (Administrative Assistant)  
Holly Grandy-Miller (Facilitator)  
Larry Collar (Facilitator)

The meeting started at 10:00 with the meeting facilitators welcoming the group, introductions, reviewing the logistics, and the following expected outcomes:

#### **Expected Outcomes of the meeting:**

1. Establish purpose and scope of the group.
2. Increased understanding feedback from blogs and town hall meetings.
3. Increased understanding of the perspective of the legislature re: funding and accountability
4. Draft "Guiding Principles of the Library Co-op" of the near Future
5. Draft list of state funded services or deliverables from the Library Co-op of the near Future
6. Draft models of accountability with benefits and risks

The facilitators noted that the morning treats and lunch was paid for with private, not state funds.

The group reviewed their purpose and scope of the work. Nancy Robertson provided a handout with details on the scope of work for the committee. Nancy also presented an electronic slideshow as a conversation recap

from the web blog, town hall style meetings, letters and other sources of feedback. She provided a handout on these themes. The following were additional themes that the group identified.

#### Additional Themes

- Diversity and Disparity of the co-ops will be a challenge to coming to a solution
- Focus on what they want and need – vs. – the constraints of the Public Act currently in place.
- Library Services to residents is the focus and should be preserved and/or enhanced.

Mark Hoffman provided a legislative perspective to the group. His remarks were captured by the facilitators in the following outline:

How the Legislature Listens	What Legislature Looks For	Successful Messages to Send
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple messages (keep it short and simple)</li> <li>• How will this “play” back home?</li> <li>• Can this show that “I” had a role in change?</li> <li>• Does it have the “glam” factor?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consolidation/Reform/Collaboration</li> <li>• Outcome based i.e. the product we sell must be <u>measurable</u> to what “Joe Citizen” can <u>see</u>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent</li> <li>• How “it” helps the economy</li> <li>• How “it” moves us to high tech</li> <li>• How we know “it” gets results</li> </ul>

#### Team Work on Successes, Service and Principles

The facilitators broke the group into teams. The teams began work to identify the following:

1. What are the successes of the library cooperative system?
2. What’s not working?
3. What are the five direct service items that residents obtain from the state aid funding?
4. If the money went away, what would be the adverse impact to the state’s residents?
5. What are the common guiding principles of the Library Co-op?
6. What are the guiding principles of the Library Co-op in the near future?

Successes	Not Working
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Swing (indirect) state aid</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Swing (indirect) state aid</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resource sharing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– delivery services</li> <li>– sharing materials</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuing education</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication between co-op members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared ILL</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuing education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery services</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared ILL &amp; ILS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistency of service/equity of service</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oversight/accountability</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy-grass roots</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tech support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Competitive salary for directors</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaboration, including reduced costs for large libraries as well as small</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communications</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disparity in benefit between large vs. small</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy-grass roots</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Value to users - MI residents</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple common message</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confusion of how/who can be members of which</li> </ul>

	co-op
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding of impact/value by policy makers, e.g. government cut 50%. Senate at one point said 100% cut</li> </ul>

1. Five direct service items that residents obtain from the state aid funding.	2. If the money went away, what would be the adverse impact to the state's residents?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statewide (regional) Resource Sharing Borrowing materials (books, audio, video). Efficiently finding materials.</li> <li>Discounts buy more (group purchasing, internet connectivity)</li> <li>Technology support</li> <li>Training borrowers/residents</li> <li>Delivery</li> <li>E-rate assistance means more connectivity for patrons</li> <li>MeL (LSTA \$)</li> <li>Statewide ILL (LSTA \$)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fewer Materials</li> <li>Hours reduced at libraries</li> <li>Staff reduced at libraries</li> <li>Inconsistency of equity for core library services statewide</li> <li>Patrons would have to rely <u>only</u> on their local library which is often under-funded and insufficient.</li> </ul>

The group reviewed the team's work on successes, services and what's not working. They came up with the following short list of Items the Legislature should know concerning what's working and what is at risk with the funding:

#### What's Working Now

- Resource sharing
- Close the gaps in education through resource sharing
- Aggregate purchasing power
- Vendor discounts through negotiation

#### Current Direct Services at Risk

- Residents have small collection of books to choose from
- In some areas, residents have fewer hours to connect to internet/computers/state electronic services
- Residents have fewer libraries at which to drop off resources
- In some areas, residents would lose the introduction/access to new learning technologies
- Small/poor communities would have fewer libraries and less access to collections.

The group continued by reviewing the team's work on Guiding Principles.

Guiding Principles	
NOTE: The table team that developed this material felt that all the items under "Now" also fit under "Future"	
Now	Future
Cost Saving	More visibility
Efficiency	Advocacy
Standardization	Accountability
Maintain professionalism in libraries	More efficient, less overhead
Equity	Equal/equitable access to all

Multi-type cooperation	Measurable results
Professional knowledge	Consistency of core services to the end users
Economies of scale	
Resource sharing	
Innovation	

The facilitators asked the group to come up with a concise list of guiding principles. There was discussion around the question of is this guiding principles for the Co-Ops or for how the state funding is spent. The group came up with the following:

**Guiding Principle:** Ensure a benchmark of service is delivered to the residents of the state.

Benchmarks such as:

- Equity (library & resident)
- Efficiency
- Cost Effectiveness

It was noted that this Guiding Principle will need additional word smithing.

### **Common Core Services (Today's Library Cooperative)**

The group broke into new teams to discuss the common core services the Co-ops provide and/or might provide considering the draft guiding principles. The table teams brainstormed the common core services and/or deliverables.

Team A	Team B	Team C
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MeL Cat 2.0 and reported borrowing</li> <li>• MeL Databases e.g. add Tutor.com</li> <li>• Statewide Delivery</li> <li>• Sustaining LSTA</li> <li>• Continuing Ed</li> <li>• Statewide Discounts</li> <li>• OCLC/Beyond MeLCat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statewide services</li> <li>• Catalog</li> <li>• Delivery</li> <li>• Electronic resources</li> <li>• Broadband connectivity</li> <li>• Tech Support</li> <li>• Education/communication regarding library value</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Est. and ensure minimum level of technology (computers, etc) available</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Staff and public</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Aggregate buying</li> <li>• Consultation of member libraries</li> </ul>

The group narrowed that list to the following services:

- Residents' access to books, etc., through statewide reciprocal resource-sharing systems
- Regional tech support to ensure residents' access to technology
- Delivery of resources
- Continuing education
- Training/Best practice sharing
- Access to electronic resources such as databases via broadband connectivity

- Aggregate purchasing

The group then identified the future Common Core Services related to State Funding by dot voting on the narrowed list. The following 3 services received the top votes.

### **Future Library Regional or Statewide Core Services Related to State Funding.**

- Resident access to books, etc., through statewide reciprocal resource-sharing systems. (14 votes)
- Delivery of resources (13 votes)
- Access to electronic resources such as databases via broadband connectivity (13 votes)

### **Models of Accountability**

The group was asked to draft models of accountability based on the Guiding Principle and the Future Core Services. The models should answer the question on “How will we hold ourselves accountable for the pot of money that is state aid to public libraries?” Once the models were presented to the group, participants were asked to identify the risks and benefits of the models.

Each group designed a visual of each model. On the visual are noted the risks and benefits. (See attached)

### **Equitable Use**

The group was asked to identify the questions they have around the concept of equitable use. The following questions will be used to begin the conversation on defining equitable use at the next meeting.

What does it mean?

From whose viewpoint?

How is this defined for a funding approach?

What is a balance between local control and state \$\$?

What happens with flux funding (this year we have \$\$, next year we may not)

Impact on excelling libraries –vs- How do we ensure everyone gains value? (small & big)

Does this mean equitable distribution of funding and state services? (under funding of state \$\$)?

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned with the agreement that the team would meet again. Nancy Robertson will schedule the next meeting.